UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/578,308	05/04/2006	Yoshimasa Sakata	062490	5752
38834 7590 12/28/2009 WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP		EXAMINER		
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW SUITE 700			MATZEK, MATTHEW D	
WASHINGTON, DC 20036			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1794	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/28/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentmail@whda.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
N. 42 CAL 1	10/578,308	SAKATA ET AL.			
Notice of Abandonment	Examiner	Art Unit			
	MATTHEW D. MATZEK	1794			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app					
This application is abandoned in view of:					
Applicant's failure to timely file a proper reply to the Office (a) ☐ A reply was received on (with a Certificate of M period for reply (including a total extension of time of, but it does not be a proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on	failing or Transmission dated month(s)) which expired on	<u> </u>			
(A proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 to a final rejection application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C	n consists only of: (1) a timely filed ar Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); o	nendment which places the			
(c) A reply was received on but it does not constitute a proper reply, or a bona fide attempt at a proper reply, to the non-final rejection. See 37 CFR 1.85(a) and 1.111. (See explanation in box 7 below).					
(d) 🛮 No reply has been received.					
 2. Applicant's failure to timely pay the required issue fee and from the mailing date of the Notice of Allowance (PTOL-8: (a) The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, was	5). received on (with a Certifica	ate of Mailing or Transmission dated			
(b) ☐ The submitted fee of \$ is insufficient. A balance of \$ is due.					
The issue fee required by 37 CFR 1.18 is \$ The publication fee, if required by 37 CFR 1.18(d), is \$					
(c) \square The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, has not been received.					
3. Applicant's failure to timely file corrected drawings as required Allowability (PTO-37).					
(a) Proposed corrected drawings were received on (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated), which is after the expiration of the period for reply.					
(b) ☐ No corrected drawings have been received.					
 The letter of express abandonment which is signed by the the applicants. 	e attorney or agent of record, the assi	ignee of the entire interest, or all of			
5. The letter of express abandonment which is signed by an attorney or agent (acting in a representative capacity under 37 CFR 1.34(a)) upon the filing of a continuing application.					
6. The decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interference of the decision has expired and there are no allowed claim		e the period for seeking court review			
7. ☑ The reason(s) below:					
The examiner contacted Ryan Chirnomas on 12.18. case is abandoned.	2009 and confirmed that no resp	onse was filed; therefore, the			
/D. Lawrence Tarazano/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1794	/Matthew D Matzek/ Examiner, Art Unit 1794				
Petitions to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(a) or (b), or requests to withdra	w the holding of abandonment under 37 (CFR 1.181, should be promptly filed to			